

REMARKS

Claims 6-10 have been canceled. Claims 2-5, amended claim 1, and new claims 11-14 are in this application.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,545,709 B2 (Takei et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,720,866 B1 (Sorrells et al.).

Independent claim 1 has been amended herein. As a result, amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"the data supply source apparatus is operable to photograph a moving image or a still image and to perform an **RFID (Radio Frequency Identification) tag function that transmits image data** obtained from a photographing operation by a back scattering scheme by absorbing or reflecting external radio waves provided by the data provided destination apparatus in accordance with a bit string of the data through an on/off control of an antenna switch to make an antenna in a terminated state or an open state; and

the data provided destination apparatus is operable to perform a reader function that transmits the radio waves in a predetermined frequency band and **reads data of an RFID tag in accordance with reflected waves from the data supply source apparatus which represent the image data obtained from the photographing operation.**" (Emphasis added.)

Initially, it is respectfully submitted that the present application provides support for the features herein added to claim 1. With regard thereto and as an example, reference is made to paragraph 0020 of the present application.

In explaining the above 103 rejection with regard to claim 1 and as best understood, the Examiner appears to assert

that element 300 of Fig. 3 or 400 of Fig. 4 is the present data supply source apparatus and that element 903 of Fig. 10 is the present data provided destination apparatus, except for the RFID functions which the Examiner appears to rely on Sorrells (and in particular, lines 1-9, 11-17, and 19-27 of column 2; lines 10-26 of column 4; lines 52-58 of column 6 and Fig. 7B of Sorrells).

It is respectfully requested that the above 103 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

First, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified portions of Takei and Sorrells relied on by the Examiner do not appear to disclose the data supply source apparatus and the data provided destination apparatus as now specifically recited in claim 1. As an example, neither such portions of Takei nor such portions of Sorrells appear to disclose data supply source apparatus operable to photograph a moving image or a still image "and to perform an RFID (Radio Frequency Identification) tag function that transmits image data . . ." and data provided destination apparatus operable to perform a reader function that transmits the radio waves in a predetermined frequency band and "reads data of an RFID tag in accordance with reflected waves from the data supply source apparatus which represent the image data obtained from the photographing operation."

Second, it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Takei and Sorrells in the manner apparently proposed by the Examiner. As an example, and as described throughout the present application, an advantage of a RFID system to transmit image data (such as that of claim 1) is low power consumption. (See, for example, paragraph 0077 of the present application.) Although Takei appears to provide a technique for wirelessly transmitting data (which may be image data) which may result in

low power consumption, such technique of Takei does not include the use of a RFID arrangement. Instead, such technique of Takei appears to involve controlling a recording operation according to a reception status so as to suppress wasted use. (See, for example, the abstract of Takei.) Accordingly, since Takei already indicates a method for wirelessly transmitting image data and for reducing power consumption, it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to combine the RFID arrangement of Sorrells with Takei.

Claims 2 and 3 are dependent from independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is also respectfully requested that the above 103 rejection of claims 2 and 3 be withdrawn for at least the reasons previously described.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takei in view of Sorrells and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,095 (Maeda et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,686,829 B1 (Hohberger et al.).

Claim 4 is dependent from independent claim 1. The Examiner does not appear to rely on either Maeda or Hohberger to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Takei and Sorrells. Accordingly, it is also respectfully requested that the above 103 rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn for at least the reasons previously described.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takei in view of Sorrells and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,095 B1 (Maeda et al.).

Claim 5 is dependent from independent claim 1. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Maeda to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Takei and Sorrells. Accordingly, it is also respectfully requested that the above 103 rejection of

claim 5 be withdrawn for at least the reasons previously described.

New claims 11-14 have been added herein. Such new claims depend from independent claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the present application provides support for the features of such new claims. With regard thereto and as an example, reference is made to paragraphs 0020, 0041, and 0053 of the present application.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: March 24, 2010

Respectfully submitted,
Electronic signature: /Dennis M.
Smid, Esq./
Dennis M. Smid, Esq.
Registration No.: 34,930
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant(s)